

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: February 4, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 1 of 5
Time: 7:00 PM

In addition to members of the public (per sign in sheets), the meeting was attended and facilitated by :

Tim Motzer, Project Manager, Seattle Parks and Recreation
Mareatha Counts, Seattle Parks and Recreation
Jeff Girvin, The Berger Partnership
Guy Michaelsen, The Berger Partnership
Elizabeta Stacishin, The Berger Partnership

Purpose: Community Meeting #2 Presentation of Gasworks NW Corner Concept Design Schemes A, B & C.

Meeting Summary:

Introduction

Tim Motzer introduced the project outlining “How we got here”, including summary of the last meeting, next step in the process.

Design Presentation

The Berger Partnership’s Guy Michaelsen presented 3 “full” plans to the public and presented derivative plans showing what portions of the presented projects could be completed for the project budget. In summary, all three derivative budgets included primarily soil work, contamination cover, irrigation, grass, paths and selective wall cuts and removal. Jeff Girvin, then shared feedback from project reviews already completed.

Community Comment

Attendees of the meeting were provided the opportunity to comment regarding the three presented schemes. Community members may also submit written comments to the design team. The following is a general summary of comments and issues, not a record of every comment or commenter:

- Supports a having dog run. Upset that Ken Bounds can simply reject an off-leash area when public input was clearly in favor of one.
- “Dogs help keep parks safe”.

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: February 4, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 2 of 5
Time: 7:00 PM

- Vegetation along the existing walls is desirable
- “What is the program? Why would I go there?” “What is the theme? What will we discover?”
- Why not remove the wall altogether? Concerned about dangerous blind spots.
- Off-leash area in SDOT R.O.W. too small, “set-up to fail”.
- “Why hide the off leash area?” wants the off-leash area to be within the walled site.
- Playing up the access to Waterway 20 is a gamble that may not be realized.
- There is no need for additional parking. Favors eliminating angled parking near proposed cul-de-sac.
- Keep views open as shown on Scheme C.
- Waterway 20 access is good, it forces the future improvement of that site.
- Eliminate east wall entirely.
- Integrate cookouts and picnic tables near parking lot.
- Eliminate prow wall, open visual access into park from Northwest corner.
- Prefers scheme B but with better connection to Wallingford steps.
- Create gathering areas, provide picnic areas, etc.
- Assume this section of the park has its own “view precinct”-to Waterway 20
- Both schemes A and B seem too rigid.
- Eliminating prow will allow headlights into park in Scheme A. That would have a very negative effect within the entire parcel.
- Prefers Scheme C - informal is better.
- No critical need for additional parking.
- Connection to Wallingford Steps is important, needs to be played up.
- Ring should be read larger and stronger.
- Make entry to Park larger and gracious - Scheme A is better but not there yet.
- It is good to emphasize Waterway 20 view.
- Planting next to curb is preferred as it separates the pedestrian from auto traffic.
- Incorporate water and wetland habitat.
- Believes SPU would be willing to deal with storm water in southwest area.
- Appreciates open view sheds.
- Appreciates the generous connection to park as it better integrates this site to the rest of Gasworks.
- Believes windows on the north wall would help diminish its harsh, uninviting quality.

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: February 4, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 3 of 5
Time: 7:00 PM

- Wallingford Steps connection not good enough in any of the schemes.
- Straight through paths are too awkward, do not work within context.
- Prefers to retain Prow wall, as he fears cars will otherwise dominate the open space.
- Likes prow hill, he feels it is bold and consistent with the rest of the park.
- Eliminate east wall altogether.
- Remove prow wall but enlarge Prow hill to serve as corner barrier.
- Likes some trees in park.
- Consolidate the two east-west paths on the south. Would like path to be inside wall.
- Would like to see major off-leash area. Ken Bounds has no authority to veto off-leash area. Resolution from City Council to create more off-leash areas. It provides parameters; distances from residences, etc. and based on these criteria “This site is ideal for an off-leash area”. There should be no vote until a scheme with a large off-leash area, inside the wall, is presented.
- Design Team should disregard opinion of Parks superintendent and do what community wants, city council might allow that.
- Off-leash area – the single most used amenity in Seattle parks that have them.
- Would like the park to be people oriented.
- It is important that site be wheelchair accessible.
- Prefers to open up views, it brings continuity to the expansiveness that is typical of the rest of Gasworks Park.
- Windows on east wall are good.
- Connection to Wallingford Steps is important. It needs to be more prominent than in Schemes B and C.
- Include off leash area in northwest corner of Scheme A.
- Purpose of this site should be an off-leash area for dogs.
- “Invest money within wall”, make no improvements outside Park property boundaries with Park’s money.
- “Entry plaza” at the south side could be mirror image of the north (Wallingford Steps).
- No need for parking on west side, widen planting strip instead.
- Keep cul-de-sac shorter to allow better connection to Waterway 20.
- Open east wall and incorporate picnic areas.

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: February 4, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 4 of 5
Time: 7:00 PM

- Be cautious of removing trees – “there is not a view issue”. Existing “wall of trees” is important as it screens views from park to neighborhood. Scheme C shows too big a view gap. Likes the entry threshold the trees create.
- Get rid of wall as much as possible. Create something more than open space and paths.
- Likes broad transition to existing park.
- Ornamental deciduous trees are desirable.

Community “Vote”

All attendees were provided with 1 green dot and three dots with which to “vote for a plan and elements of plans which they favored. The green dot was for attendees to “vote” for the overall park scheme they preferred with regards to character, layout and relation to the rest of the existing Gas Works Park. The three orange dots were to be used to “vote for the three elements of any of the plans, which they most favored, so that popular element could be identified and possibly integrated into the preferred concept plan. As a result of comments voiced in favor of a bigger off leash area than had been presented, a fourth voting option, and blank piece of paper simply titled, “ large Off-leash area in park” was posted and included in the voting. The summary of the voting is as follows:

Green Dots- votes for overall concept

Scheme A Concept (tank rings) – 14 votes
Scheme B Concept (earth shelves) – 7 ½ votes
Scheme C Concept (prow hill) – 13 votes
“Large off leash area in park” (concept, not designed) – 12 ½ votes

Orange Dots –votes for particular features

Common Features (in all 3 schemes)

Waterway 20 connect	8
Burke-Gillman pedestrian connection	8

Scheme A Features

Meeting Notes

Project: Gasworks Park
Date: February 4, 2003
Location: Hamilton Middle School

Page: 5 of 5
Time: 7:00 PM

Evergreen screen and extension	5
Connection to Wallingford Steps	19
Trees inside walled site	6
Enclosed prow space	3
Keep prow wall	2
Oil tank rings	2

Scheme B Features

Promenade	3
Open prow allow view into park	6
Upper walkway	7

Scheme C Features

Prow hill	4
One large oil tank ring	7
Widened view corridor to Kite Hill	14

Meeting Wrap-Up:

Tim to outlined next steps for the design and community input process, the creation of a preferred concept plan and another round of “milestone meetings” in late February and Early March including the presentation of the preferred concept plan at a community meeting.